



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,852	12/31/2003	Oliver O. Stanchfield	TPP 31700	2816

24257 7590 07/25/2007
STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP
1615 L STREET, NW
SUITE 850
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

PLUMMER, ELIZABETH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3635

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/25/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/748,852

Applicant(s)

STANCHFIELD, OLIVER O.

Examiner

Elizabeth A. Plummer

Art Unit

3635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15, 16 and 20-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15, 16, and 20-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 06/25/2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/06/2007 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 14, line 5, the phrase "protective material, stain laminate, and veneer." appears to be missing a comma. Appropriate correction is required.

3. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not).

Misnumbered claims 30-34 been renumbered 29-33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3635

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 25 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pamplin (US Publication 2004/0060251).

- a. Regarding claim 1, Pamplin discloses a reversible molding (26) having a plurality of decorative faces (28) wherein at least two of said faces differ in at least one property selected from the group consisting of texture, design, pattern and color (page 3, paragraph 32), wherein said faces have the same shape (Fig. 2,3,4) and each of the faces can be covered with a laminate of wallpaper (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32).
- b. Regarding claim 5, at least one decorative face comprises a laminate (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32).
- c. Regarding claim 7, the face is in the shape of a wall base molding (paragraph 27).
- d. Regarding claim 10, Pamplin discloses that the molding can be used anywhere on a wall, which inherently includes along a floor and wall joint (paragraph 27).
- e. Regarding claim 11, Pamplin discloses the combination of a ceiling and wall joint (Fig. 1; paragraph 27).

Art Unit: 3635

- f. Regarding claim 25, the plurality of decorative surfaces are affixed to a core (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32), wherein the core comprises a material such as plastic (page 2, paragraph 31).
- g. Regarding claim 31, each of said faces can differ from each other of said faces (page 3, paragraph 32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2, 12, 13, 20, 27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pamplin (US Publication 2004/0060251).

a. Regarding claim 2, Pamplin discloses the invention as claimed except for the molding comprises a wood product selected from the group consisting of particle board, MDF, HDF and veneered lumber. However, it would have been a matter of obvious design choice to form the molding out of a wood product such as particle board, MDF, HDF or veneered lumber, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

b. Regarding claim 12, Pamplin discloses the invention as claimed except for the floor being a laminate floor. However, it would have been a matter of obvious

design choice to form the floor out of a laminate, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

c. Regarding claim 13, Pamplin discloses the invention as claimed except for the wall or ceiling comprising a laminate wall panel or a laminate ceiling panel.

However, it would have been a matter of obvious design choice to form the wall panel or ceiling panel out of a laminate, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re

Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

d. Regarding claim 20, Pamplin discloses a method of inherently reducing molding inventories comprising offering a molding comprising a plurality of decorative faces (28) wherein at least two of said faces differ in at least one property, including texture, design, pattern and color (page 3, paragraph 32), and each of said faces independently comprises a laminate (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32). While Pamplin does not disclose that the molding is necessarily offered to a purchaser of molding inventories and then sold to the purchaser, it is notoriously well known in the art the moldings can be sold to a purchaser of molding inventories.

Art Unit: 3635

e. Regarding claim 27, the plurality of decorative surfaces are affixed to a core (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32), wherein the core comprises a material such as plastic (page 2, paragraph 31).

f. Regarding claim 33, each of said faces can differ from each other of said faces (page 3, paragraph 32).

8. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lamont et al. (US Patent 5,711,123) in view of Pamplin (US Publication 2004/0060251).

a. Regarding claim 1, Lamont et al. teaches a molding (4) having a plurality of decorative faces each having the same shape (Fig. 3; column 4, lines 1-30). While Lamont et al. does not specify that at least two of the faces differ in at least one property selected from texture, design, pattern and color, wherein each of the faces independently comprises foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain or clear protective material, it is notoriously well known in the art that molding can have at least two of the faces differ in at least one property selected from texture, design, pattern and color, wherein each of the faces independently comprises foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain or clear protective material. For example, Pamplin discloses a reversible molding (26) having a plurality of decorative faces (28) wherein at least two of said faces differ in at least one property selected from the group consisting of texture, design, pattern and color (page 3, paragraph 32), wherein said faces have the same shape (Fig. 2,3,4) and each of the faces can be covered with a laminate of wallpaper (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32) in order to create multiple decorative designs. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 3635

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lamont et al. to have a molding comprising at least two of the faces differ in at least one property selected from texture, design, pattern and color, wherein each of the faces independently comprises foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain or clear protective material, such as taught by Pamplin, in order to create more decorative designs.

b. Regarding claim 3, Lamont et al. further discloses the faces can comprise a curved surface (Fig. 3).

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pamplin (US Publication 2004/0060251) in view of Kornfalt et al. (US Patent 6,517,935).

Regarding claim 4, Pamplin discloses at least one decorative face comprising a printed decor paper (page 2, paragraph 31). While Pamplin does not disclose that the paper is covered with an overlay of a-cellulose, it is notoriously well known in the art that a printed décor paper can comprise an overlay of a-cellulose. For example, Kornfalt et al. teaches a molding with décor paper having an overlay of a-cellulose in order to protect the molding from abrasion (column 2, lines 9-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pamplin to include an overlay of a-cellulose, such as taught by Kornfalt et al., in order to better protect the molding.

10. Claims 1, 8 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sumner (GB 2,141,457 A) in view of Pamplin (US Publication 2004.0060251).

- a. Regarding claim 1, Sumner discloses a reversible molding (12) having a plurality of decorative faces, wherein the faces have the shape (Fig. 1). While Sumner does not specifically disclose that faces differ by texture, design, pattern or color and independently comprise foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain or clear protective material, it is notoriously well known in the art that a molding with multiple faces can have that faces differ by texture, design, pattern or color and independently comprise foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain or clear protective material. For example, Pamplin discloses a reversible molding (26) having a plurality of decorative faces (28) wherein at least two of said faces differ in at least one property selected from the group consisting of texture, design, pattern and color (page 3, paragraph 32), wherein said faces have the same shape (Fig. 2,3,4) and each of the faces can be covered with a laminate of wallpaper (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32) in order to create multiple decorative designs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sumner to have a molding comprising at least two of the faces differ in at least one property selected from texture, design, pattern and color, wherein each of the faces independently comprises foil, laminate, veneer, paint, stain or clear protective material, such as taught by Pamplin, in order to create more decorative designs.
- b. Regarding claim 8, each of said faces is in the form of a base shoe (Fig. 1).

c. Regarding claim 30, Sumner in view of Pamplin teaches the invention as claimed except for each of the faces being in the form of a quarter round.

However, It would have been a matter of obvious design choice each face as a quarter round, as such a modification would have involved a mere change in shape of a component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Dailey, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

11. Claims 14-16, 20-24, 26, 28, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford (GB 2,096,665 A) in view of Pamplin (US Publication 2004/0060251).

a. Regarding claim 14, Ford discloses a reversible molding (5) having a plurality of faces (abstract) wherein at least two of said faces different in shape (abstract; Fig. 2,4). Ford does not disclose that the faces also differ in at least one additional property consisting of texture, design, pattern and color, and each of the faces independently comprise foil, paint, clear protective material, stain, laminate or veneer. However, it is notoriously well known in the art that a reversible molding can have faces which differ in texture, design, pattern, or color, the faces comprising foil, paint, clear protective material, stain, laminate or veneer. For example, Pamplin teaches a reversible molding (26) having a plurality of decorative faces (28) wherein at least two of the faces differ in texture, design, pattern and color (page 3, paragraph 32) and comprise a laminate (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32), in order to create more aesthetically pleasing designs. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ford to include faces differing in texture, design, pattern or color and comprising a laminate, such as taught by Pamplin, in order to create more varied and pleasing molding designs.

b. Regarding claim 15, Ford in view of Pamplin discloses the invention as claimed except for the core of the reversible molding comprising particle board, MDF or HDF. However, it would have been a matter of obvious design choice to form the core of the molding out of a wood product such as particle board, MDF, or HDF, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

c. Regarding claims 16 and 21, Ford in view of Pamplin discloses the invention as claimed except for each of the faces comprising a foil. However, it would have been a matter of obvious design choice to form the faces comprising foil, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

d. Regarding claim 20, Ford discloses a method of inherently reducing molding inventories comprising offering a molding comprising a plurality of decorative faces (28). Ford does not disclose that at least two of said faces differ in at least one property, including texture, design, pattern and color (page 3, paragraph 32), and each of said faces independently comprises a laminate (Fig.

3; page 2, paragraph 32). However, it is notoriously well known in the art that a reversible molding can have faces which differ in texture, design, pattern, or color, the faces independently comprising foil, paint, clear protective material, stain, laminate or veneer. For example, Pamplin teaches a reversible molding (26) having a plurality of decorative faces (28) wherein at least two of the faces differ in texture, design, pattern and color (page 3, paragraph 32) and comprise a laminate (Fig. 3; page 2, paragraph 32), in order to create more aesthetically pleasing designs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ford to include faces differing in texture, design, pattern or color and comprising a laminate, such as taught by Pamplin, in order to create more varied and pleasing molding designs.

While Ford also does not disclose that the molding is offered to a purchaser of molding inventories and then sold to the purchaser, it is notoriously well known in the art the moldings can be sold to a purchaser of molding inventories.

e. Regarding claim 22, Ford further discloses at least one face is in the shape of a wall base molding (Fig. 2,4).

f. Regarding claims 23 and 24, Ford in view of Pamplin discloses the invention as claimed except for one of the faces being in the shape of a quarter round or base shoe. However, It would have been a matter of obvious design choice at least one face as a quarter round or base shoe, as such a modification would have involved a mere change in shape of a component. A change in

shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

In re Dailey, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966).

g. Regarding claim 26, Ford in view of Pamplin discloses the invention as claimed except for the core of the reversible molding comprising natural wood, veneered lumber, plastic or foam. However, it would have been a matter of obvious design choice to form the core of the molding out of natural wood, veneered lumber, plastic or foam, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

h. Regarding claim 28, at least one face comprises a curved surface (Fig. 2,4).

i. Regarding claim 29, Ford further discloses that the at least one of the plurality of decorative surfaces comprises a curved surface (Fig. 2,4).

j. Regarding claim 32, each of said face's differs from each other of said faces (Fig. 2,4).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15, 16 and 20-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth A. Plummer whose telephone number is (571) 272-2246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on (571) 272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JEANETTE CHAPMAN/
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3635

EAP

EAR